

Report of Faculty Council Meeting

November 4, 2020

Faculty Council Members Present:

Brad Hull	Marc Lynn	Sokchea Lim	Joanna Garcia	Gerald Weinstein	Desmond Kwan	Jeff Dyck
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Christopher Sheil	Elena Manilich	Mark Waner	Medora Barnes	Mina Chercourt	Malia McAndrew	Angie Canda
✓		✓	✓	✓		✓
Colin Swearingen	Karen Gygli	Brent Brossmann	Sejung Park	Bo Liu	Gerald Guest	Yi Shang
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kristen Tobey	Earl Spurgin	Zeki Saritoprak	Deniz Durmus			
✓	✓	✓	✓			

1. Brendan Dolan visit – Chair, Staff Council

- Brent Brossman was invited to a staff council meeting as guest. He and Dolan are actively working together to improve communication between faculty and staff councils.
- Dolan talked about the history and focuses of the staff council:
 - The current version of the staff council was formed 6 years ago after restructuring based on HLC feedback. The founding document of the staff council states that its existence and authority are derived from the office of the president.
 - Structure: 9-member executive committee; 27-member staff council; vice-chairs of committees that focus on particular areas; at-large members sitting on different committees.
 - Main roles: 1) as a consultative body, providing feedbacks on e.g. HR policy reviews and administrative policy reviews; consulted by SLT on various staff-related issues. 2) advocacy work: listening sessions with staff community, employer resource groups; annual survey of the staff community; create ad-hoc committees with different focuses (last year created an ad-hoc committee on the experiences of administrative assistants, and shared a report with HR and SLT.) 3) building morale and making connections between staff colleagues across the campus (the campus

colleague program, currently managed by HR, is staffed by volunteers from the staff council. Employer resource groups are open to faculty, e.g. one of the groups for working parents and legal guardians have faculty as well as staff members.)

- Earl: it was said that staff had not been informed about who was “right-sized”. Is that still the case?
 - Brendan: we know numbers, but there is no full list. Through our SLT liaison Lauri Strimkovsky, we asked different divisions to send information about who is doing what work. HR has shared the organizational chart of the university, which has been very helpful. With these and the total number of separations, we have that (information) now.
 - Brent: what can we do to help?
 - Brendan: asking the question of should a staff person be part of the conversation; listening to staff colleagues and knowing they are hurting; engaging in the effort of recognizing staff members, e.g. writing a quick recognition in our monthly newsletter; keeping the connection between faculty and staff council that has been built recently, especially after the transition of the current chairs from their positions.
2. Approve minutes: Minutes of FC 9/2 meeting approved by acclamation.
3. UCEP Proposals
- 1) UCEP grad students academic standing and probation policy proposal:
 - Unanimously accepted by CAP.
 - Concern about dismissal from programs. Rebecca explained that this part of the policy was intentionally left vague to give flexibility to program coordinators. This kind of event is also very infrequent.
 - 2) Major declaration and internal transfer policy proposal:
 - CAP raised concerns about leaving more options to students who come to JCU without declaring majors, and suggested additions for transfer students between Boler and CAS.
 - UCEP accepted the concerns, revised the proposals accordingly. CAP unanimously accepted the revised proposal
 - 3) Earl Spurgin moved to send the proposals to the full faculty, Jeff Dyck seconded,
 - 4) Discussion:
 - Chris Sheil: the second proposal is not clear on how to deal with transfer students from outside the institution, which might be a separate policy.
 - Medora: we ran into problems this summer when incoming freshmen declared majors, and was assigned a major advisor and a separate cohort-advisor. The advising process needs to be figured out for these students.
 - Chris Sheil: We need to come up with a term for students who are undeclared. “undeclared” sounds wishy-washy. There also needs to be resources for these students. They need advices about how to explore effectively. There is a real advantage for larger departments to be able to identify students who are decided on their majors. But the advising piece still needs to be stronger in many ways. As the proposal outlines, there will need to be benchmarks for when and how a student is told they can’t continue with a major.

- Brent: given that exploration is one of our strengths as an institution, using that term could be a strong selling point to help students embrace that notion that they are not undecided, they are exploring their options.
 - Jeff Dyck: Language in the proposal about being included in the 2020-21 bulletin should be changed. There needs to be a serious effort at building an advising model that comes in at the same time as the policies.
 - Brent: given that the realm of advising is in flux at the moment, is it worth putting this into effect understanding that we are coming back to adapt the advising policy to fit it? I don't think we can set up an advising policy now. We can set up guidelines. We can either wait for a year before pushing the proposal, or we can push it now and fix the advising later.
 - Zeki: we explained our concern about transfer students to UCEP. They will probably have a separate policy for that.
- 5) Vote to send to the general faculty meeting on 11/18: yes-20; no-0
4. Review and possibly send to Faculty - University Tenure Committee Proposal – Jeff Dyck
- 1) Jeff presented the proposal (see proposal draft in supporting document)
 - 2) Discussions:
 - Medora: you said that people who were already hired into the tenure track would have the option to do this, but those who were associate professors going up for full will be required to follow this process. So those who are planning on going up for full this fall, instead of turning in 9/30, would turn in on 9/1 and would be going through this system. will there be time for people to get elected and be trained for the new system this fall? The issue of transition time needs to be looked at more closely. People need 12-18 months to transition into the new system.
 - Brent: if proposal is good, timing can be specified in the amendment easily.
 - Earl: as the provost said faculty members are tenured to the department, how is that related to UTCP?
 - Jeff: Steve was astounded that we don't have this university-wide tenure committee, but that was before the pandemic. He is in favor of this layer of faculty review.
 - Greg Farnell: why would people going up to full not be grandfathered in?
 - Jeff: it is a complicated issue. We had long discussions about legal implications etc. We in the RGP settled on the fact that this is the cleanest way to do it. The transition policy won't be in the language of the actual handbook amendments. It would be in the supporting document.
 - Brent: there are clearly efficiency questions and equity questions. We may need to have more conversations about it.
 - 3) Chris Sheil moved to advance it to the full faculty, Jerry Weinstein seconded, yes-18; no-0
 - 4) Brent will send the two UCEP proposals and the UTCP to the full faculty tomorrow 11/5/20.
5. Response to Student Senate requests on HyFlex
- Requests: 1) record lectures and make them available to students; 2) have a coherent canvas setup; 3) allow asynchronous student attendance without penalty.

- Brent: The requests are consistent with the policies of the teaching and Research committee, nuts-and-bolts committee, as well as with the general faculty practice. They are also, the first and second requests, fairly easy to do.
- Jerry Weinstein: opposed to the 2nd and the 3rd part of the requests
- Brent: some faculty members still don't have their assignments online.
- Jerry: they should be recommendations to the faculty, instead of requirements.
- Kristen Tobey: issues with the 1st and 3rd request. Students may not want to be recorded when there are sensitive and controversial discussions. If we approve the first part, there should be language about exceptions to the recording. In terms of attendance policy, I'm willing to be flexible when students are sick, but there must be expectations for student attendance.
- Joanna Garcia: agree with Jerry and Kristen on the 3rd request. Regarding the 1st one, if we teach multiple sections of a class, there should be no need to record all sections.
- Brent: we can ask faculty to provide recording when it's feasible and provide explanations when it's not.
- Marc Lynn: in terms of recording class, we can let students know that before they speak they can require recording to be paused.
- Medora: breakout rooms are not recorded. I don't have an attendance policy, but I have a participation policy. I'm also against the 3rd request, although the special circumstances do require us to be flexible.
- Karen Gygli: are they ok with pre-recorded studio lectures?
- Brent: Yes.
- Bo: opposed to the 3rd request from the student outcome perspective.
- Brent: will circulate a google doc for people to draft, ask for email vote on the finished draft, and then send it to the full faculty.

6. Response to Student Senate request on Pass/Fail

- Brent is only aware of two other universities that adopted this policy. We did it for the spring given the circumstances, but didn't plan on doing it for the fall. Now we are asked by the student senate to do it anyway.
- Chris: some professional programs do not accept P/F grades if a graded option was available. If we give students this option, we must make it crystal clear to them what the consequences might be.
- Karen: this is a bad idea. I don't see a need for it this semester as much as last spring
- Jerry Weinstein: oppose. It's also too late for this semester.
- Bo: I have two students just withdrew. Had they known the P/F option, they might have made different decisions.
- Medora: difficult circumstances may continue, would we continue offering the P/F option?
- Straw poll: to send a letter to the students explaining why we won't end the existing P/F policy Yes-17; no-0.